

The Monkey-Man Evolution

ALFRED W. McCANN

(Author of "God—or Gorilla," published by the Devin-Adair Company, New York)

THROUGH a strange method of twisting and squeezing, which the great physicist, Lord Kelvin, would have called a "hokus-pokus" of science, the theory of evolution has come to mean the theory of man's monkey-origin. The wolf, fox and dog are not like the horse, ass or zebra. They are not like the white man, Indian, Chinaman, Negro or gorilla. They are not like sheep or goats, sharks or dogfish. They are like each other. The fox resembles the dog, the dog resembles the wolf, the wolf resembles the fox. Each possesses certain characters confined to a particular group, and not scattered among other groups, such, for instance, as the tiger, panther and cat. The evolutionists, as they proceed to popularize the theory of man's ape-origin, suggest a blood relationship as the explanation of the resemblances borne to each other by wolf, fox and dog; by horse, ass and zebra; by shark and dogfish; by tiger, panther and cat; by European, Indian, Chinese, Negro and gorilla. This grouping of the ape with man is an attempt at subtlety. Actual relationship of man with ape means that certain distinct and essential characters have been transmitted, unchanged, from the common ancestor of ape and man. Other characters may have been modified but the essential substance is the same. The evolutionist makes ape and man members of the same species and the doctrine of blood relationship is thus made to drag in the law of specific constancy. "Man is a true ape," says Freudenthal. To prove this specific constancy the evolutionists have gone back into the past, stopping on their way at various stations, each separated by periods of 50,000 years.

THE APE-MAN

When they get back a half million years they dig up the first "ape-man." Then they start home, and on their way dig up other "ape-men" at each of the stations. Thus they show a gradual improvement in certain ape characters. The legs slowly become longer, the arms slowly become shorter. Instead of walking on all fours, the ape-man gradually learns to walk erect. His brow begins to

climb. At first it was low and depressed. At last it is steep and high. All the grades of lowness or steepness are carefully pointed out. The brain-pan begins to get larger until, at the end of 500,000 years, it is just three times as large as it had been. It was simian at first—now it is human! Nevertheless, with all the changes, it is quite obvious that the gorilla really belongs with the Negro, Chinese, Indian and European. The ape-men fossils leave no doubt of this—*until they are examined*. The serious student will never stumble into greater surprise than when he discovers the true history of each of these ape-men fossils. The educated laity, including doctors, lawyers and clergymen who ought to know better, have for the most part accepted as genuine the fabricated freaks now exhibited by palaeontologists, in the museums, as evidence of an actual relationship between ape and man. Many clumsy efforts have been made to reconcile the significance of these "reconstructed" bone fragments with fact, as if there were any need of ever attempting to reconcile pure fancy with anything—but pure fancy. No wonder the theory of evolution, as it has been brutalized, tends to bewilder and degrade.

MAN'S DESCENT

After having taken infinite pains to "reconstruct" an enormous number of "missing links," cataloguing entire races of ape-men, beginning with the Java fraud and ending with the Piltdown fiasco, all living evolutionists, without a single exception, including even Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, are compelled to admit that "*man is not descended from any known form of ape, either living or fossil.*" No modern scientist disputes this. What, then, becomes of the "actual relationship" between man and ape when it is admitted that no such relationship exists? Why, under the circumstances, do the evolutionists go on comparing man with ape? The same question can be asked with respect to the comparisons between cat and tiger, zebra and horse, dog and fox; for if there is any one admission which modern science is compelled to make, it is this: There is not a solitary, unquestioned, genetic connection between any of our present organic forms and earlier forms. Not one connecting link has ever been dis-

covered to show a specific instance of the evolution of one form from another, but on the contrary there is evidence to show that many living creatures (horses, for instance) appeared on this earth before some of their supposed ancestors were born. Yet the horse case is said to be the strongest case, stronger even than the "ape-man" case, in support of the theory that new species have evolved out of old ones, and that man's ancestor was therefore a monkey.

NO COMMON PRIMORDIAL CELL

Even the child can recognize certain resemblances between a dog-house and a cathedral. The architect employs walls and roof. All walls are walls; all supporting pillars are pillars. All the members of the tribe of vertebrates have a backbone in common. The horse does not belong to the order of carnivora, but its skeleton is formed on jointed vertebrae. The tiger does belong to the order of carnivora. It has the same kind of jointed vertebrae. So have the bear, sheep, goat, zebra, elephant, shark and man. The Architect has built their bodies on a common plan, the best possible plan, but this fact neither proves nor warrants the suggestion that there is any more relationship between the shark and the tiger than there is between the flea and the elephant, or the goose and man. Neither the flea nor the goose is a vertebrate, yet, according to the evolutionist, both flea and goose come from the same cell that produced cat, dog, elephant, monkey and man. In this sense the theory of evolution asks us to accept as a fact the assertion that the blade of grass and the oak, the sunflower and the giraffe, the ant and the cabbage, the mosquito and the bat, the house-fly and the camel all came, as did monkey and man, from a single cell of primordial slime. After all, the theory merely maintains that whereas all plants and animals are related as cousins in the millionth degree, the relationship between simian and human may be reduced to the thousandth or hundred-thousandth degree.

INSUPERABLE OBJECTIONS AGAINST EVOLUTION

The difficulties besetting the theory are so many, so complex and so contradictory that one cannot ask for evi-

dence, but must take the whole by an act of faith more extraordinary and profound than is demanded of the soul in falling back upon God. Go back to the beginning of time, to the first fossil-bearing strata, and you are confronted at once not only by an insuperable difficulty in determining the age of the rocks, but also by the extraordinary appearance of the evidences of former life contained in them. The various estimates made by geologists differ by millions of years. No two authorities agree in their conclusions with each other. Where the first evidence of animal life is found in the Cambrian system there suddenly appear groups of creatures, snails, brachypods, cephalopods, arthropods, etc. Of the trilobites (crabs) alone more than fifty genera and a hundred and fifty species are found. The first organisms come upon the stage together, not one after the other, as evolution demands, but in extraordinary types and groups clearly separated from each other. The great varieties appear, as it were, explosively, so that considering this earliest phenomenon we are compelled to conclude, in order to square it with any theory of evolution, that even then, at the beginning of animal life, we are already infinitely far removed from the beginning. This fact troubled even Darwin, whose son Francis notes his chagrin and disappointment and comments upon the cause. Later there appear in a definite series of strata the first vertebrates and land plants. Their appearance is just as sudden and just as explosive, yet the theory of evolution demands that each of the distinctive species required millions of years to develop from some-

THE RECORDS OF THE ROCKS

In the upper Devonian the amphibia are recorded in the Record of the Rocks. In the next higher formation, Carboniferous, come the reptiles, all now extinct except the single genus *Hatteria*, still found in New Zealand, to the consternation of the evolutionists. Later appeared the turtles, crocodiles and serpents, which still remain turtles, crocodiles, and serpents despite the changed forms which they should have assumed. The history of the birds is a blank, except for the two *Archaeopteryx* which merely serve to confuse, not to enlighten. Suddenly there appear in the upper Trias the mammals, including the unexplained

Marsupials, kangaroo and opossum. Always there is an extraordinary series of suddenly extended families, genera and species. The invertebrates reaching back into the Cambrian system are quite as clearly separated into all the families and most of the classes which exist to this day, and there is no stretch of the imagination that can rationally look upon them as evolving from each other. Among the vertebrates the fishes, appearing in the Silurian, which immediately followed the Cambrian, and which are, therefore, the oldest vertebrates known, are so specifically separated from the invertebrates and make their appearance so suddenly and explosively, *leaving not a solitary trace of a bridge between them*, that one must do violence to reason who seeks to demonstrate that the altogether different types co-existing, but separate from the beginning, originated in each other. The salamanders, lizards, crocodiles and snakes, amphibians and reptiles, living contemporaneously with each other cannot be regarded as each other's ancestors. Of the origin of our present crocodiles, turtles, snakes and lizards we are in absolute ignorance.

From the very commencement of the Tertiary in the Eocene are found as fully typified and as sharply defined as at the present the whales, porpoises and bats. *They have not changed!* There are ten orders of placental mammals. They are all found clearly defined in the earliest Eocene. Not a single transitional form connecting them with any predecessors has been found. No transitional form has ever been found. No reptile with the slightest suggestion of feathers has ever been found, yet birds with fully developed feathers are supposed to have evolved by an exceedingly slow process from unfeathered reptiles. Of the thousands of species preserved in the rocks, why is there not a solitary link connecting any of them? The celebrated evolutionary law, demanding increase of size over a development of millions of years, has kinks in it. They tell us that the four-pound lemur became the two-hundred-pound man, just as the Eohippus, as small as a squirrel, became the two-thousand-pound horse; yet the ants of today are identical in size with the ants preserved in Baltic amber, and there has been no increase in the size of the house-fly, wasp, mosquito, dragon-

fly, beetle or honey-bee. Did these creatures, through an inverted process, evolve from the dinosaur or from an earlier and bigger ancestor of the dinosaur? Palaeontology clearly demonstrates that the changes or transformations never pass beyond the fixed limits of families and classes. The evidence before the eyes of men indicates that a fixed law is operating to prevent the confounding of the species. The mule is sterile. Artificial efforts to produce freaks in the animal order, even for show purposes, are abortive. Even the gorilla does not mate with the chimpanzee.

THE ADMISSIONS OF SCIENCE

No wonder Alexander Winchell exclaimed, though an evolutionist: "If we are to judge from that which is known, rather than that which is conjectured, we are compelled to conclude that the varied forms of animal life did not come into being by a gradual evolution from the Eozoön, but as so many original utterances of the all-skilled Artificer of creation." No wonder Darwin himself exclaimed: "We cannot prove the evolution of even one single species into another." No wonder Sir William Dawson exclaimed: "The compound eyes and filmy wings of insects; the teeth, bones and scales of batrachians and fishes; all are as perfectly finished, and many quite as complete and delicate, as in the animals of the present day, so that it is impossible, except by violent suppositions, to connect them genetically with any predecessors." No wonder Henry Fairfield Osborn, who insists that man has descended from the ape, admits that to prove this, *some hitherto unknown type of ape not found among living apes, and of which no fossil remains have ever been discovered, must be looked for.*

DISCORDANT VOICES

Despite the facts, Professor Charles Knight, collaborating with Professor Osborn, pointing to his half-ape, half-man reconstruction, declares: "This is our ancestor; this is the creature from which we evolved; this thing is bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. We are stirred by his passions, urged on by his nameless instincts. Forty thousand years separate us from him. But millions of

years separate him from still lower animals. He stands close to us—this cunning, fighting, hunting, ferocious Neanderthal man." This voice comes from the American Museum of Natural History. Does it sound the death knell of the moral order? Does it mean that the theory of evolution, as now interpreted by the popularizers of invention, subterfuge, inferences wholly unsupported, drawn from other inferences elaborated upon a foundation of capricious fancy and profound contempt for the Mosaic narrative of creation, demands a bestial philosophy of life? If not, why all the forgeries committed in the name of science? Why the astonishing age of classifications? They tell us that the pre-Cambrian formation described as the Azoic or Archaeozoic age, which has left no fossil evidence of life of any kind, goes back 800 million, or 80 million years. You can have your choice. They tell us that the upper Cambrian formation, described as the Protozoic, or jelly-fish age, goes back 600 million or 60 million years. They tell us that the Early Palaeozoic age, the age of the trilobites referred to above, goes back from 360 million to 36 million years. The Later Palaeozoic age, which produced the fishes, amphibia and swamp forests, is satisfied with from 260 million to 26 million years. The Mesozoic age, the age of reptiles, only needs from 140 million to 14 million years. The Cainozoic age, in which were developed mammals, grass and land forests, is almost modest in its requirements, needing but from 40 million to 4 million years.

At any rate, scientists broad enough to yield a mere stretch of 720 million years to the demands of controversy cannot be accused of narrowness in the matter of margins. Certainly there have been mistakes enough to inspire caution. The great Sir Charles Lyell, who did so much to inspire Darwin, visited Niagara Falls with Professor James Hall in 1841, for the reason that they saw in the gorge below the Falls an important chronometer for measuring the time since the recession of the great North American ice sheet. Desor, the French geologist, had given to the gorge an age of 3,000,000 years. Lyell corrected this to 100,000 years. Hall was of the opinion that as the rate of recession could not be greater than one foot a year, the time required could not be more than 35,000

years. In the surveys made, 1875, by the New York State Geologists and in 1886 by the United States Geological Survey, it was found, to the amazement of scientists, that the rate of recession was not one foot a year, as estimated by Hall, and not four inches a year, as estimated by Lyell, but from twenty to twenty-seven feet a year in the central part of the Horseshoe. Taking an average of five feet per annum, the members of the Geological Survey arrived at the conclusion that 7,000 years is as long a period as could possibly be assigned to the commencement of the gorge. Another chronometer is the gorge of the Mississippi River, extending from the Falls of St. Anthony at Minneapolis, to its junction with the preglacial trough of the old Mississippi at Fort Snelling, a distance of about seven miles. Here, as at Niagara, the upper strata of rock consist of hard limestone underlaid by soft sandstone, which like the underlying shale at Niagara is eroded faster than the upper strata, so that a perpendicular fall is maintained. The strata are so uniform in texture and thickness that the rate of recession of the Falls must have been from the beginning very constant. G. Frederick Wright, who himself was a member of the United States Geological Survey, says, "Man and the Glacial Period," Appleton, 1896, p. 340: "Fortunately the first discoverer of the cataract—the Catholic missionary Hennepin—was an accurate observer, and was given to recording his observations for the instruction of the outside world and of future generations. From his description, printed in Amsterdam in 1704, Professor N. H. Winchell is able to determine the precise locality of the cataract when discovered in 1680.

"Again in 1766 the Catholic missionary Carver visited the Falls, and not only wrote a description, but made a sketch (found in an account of his travels, published in London in 1788) which confirms the inferences drawn from Hennepin's narrative. The actual period of recession extends to the year 1856, at which time such artificial changes were introduced as to modify the rate of recession and disturb further calculations. But between 1680 and 1766 the Falls had evidently receded about 412 feet. Between 1766 and 1856 the recession had been 600 feet. The average rate is estimated by Professor Winchell to be

about five feet per year, and the total length of time required for the formation of the gorge above Fort Snelling is about the same as that calculated by Woodward and Gilbert for the Niagara gorge,"—some 7,000 years, not 3,000,000 years! Thus does science get closer and closer, in some respects, in its belated tendency to return to the chronology of the Bible, according to which the Jews reckon that 5,682 years have elapsed since the creation of Adam.

INACCURATE METHODS

There is very obviously something wrong with the methods employed in estimating the age of the world, and the antiquity of the fossil remains imbedded in its various geological strata. Darwin himself had many misgivings upon the subject. In the first edition of his "Origin of Species" he estimated that the time required for the erosion of the Wealden deposits in England was 306,662,400 years, which he spoke of as "a mere trifle" of that at command for establishing his theory of the origin of species through natural selection. In his second edition, however, he confesses that his original estimate concerning the length of geological time was rash; while in later editions he quietly omitted it. Sir William Thomson demonstrated that life could not have existed on the surface of this earth more than ten or twelve million years ago for the reason that it was so hot as to render life impossible. Darwin winced at this demonstration and declared that Thomson had come into his theory like an "odious specter," yet the 1921 figures compiled from geologists, physicists, astronomers and other scientists by H. G. Wells give us all the hundreds of millions of years previously referred to, as if they were matters of fact, and not of fancy.

AN EXTRAORDINARY FOSSIL

To make matters worse we are compelled to deal with what is probably the most extraordinary fossil specimen ever discovered. The writer has had this specimen in his hands and has examined it microscopically. It consists of a piece of Triassic rock which goes back, according to the geologists' figures, from 36 to 360 million years. The

specimen was discovered by Mr. Albert Knapp on the eastern slope of the West Humboldt Mountains, Pershing County, Nevada, about twenty-five miles due easterly of the town of Lovelock. The exact spot of its discovery was the north slope of the side hill projecting into the canyon about two miles south of what is known as Fisher Canyon. This hill is known as Buffalo Peak. The rock itself is Triassic limestone marked with veinlets of calc-spar characteristic of the limestone of the Triassic period. It is commonly referred to as blue limestone of the intermountain area. It has been perfectly preserved from what the geologists call any agencies of metamorphism. That the whole formation from which it was taken is truly of Triassic age is established by the records of The Fortieth Parallel Survey, mapped by Clarence King, the geologist in charge, as "Star Peak Triassic." These records were prepared under the supervision of the War Department, 1873, in the form of nine volumes published under the direction of the Secretary of War. They are not catalogued as part of the geological records of the United States for the reason that the United States Geological Survey had not yet been established when the work was done. Imposed upon this piece of Triassic rock, and slightly impressed into it, is the sole of a child's shoe, No. 13. The fossil sole has been almost completely silicified and is even denser, harder and more compact than the rock itself. The first to recognize the importance of this astonishing specimen was John T. Reid of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, mining director of the Nevada United Mining Company. When he brought the thing from Lovelock, Nevada, to New York City, 1922, he did not realize that he was about to upset the conventional interpretation not only of the age of the world, but of evolution. A human fossil imposed on Triassic rock either means that man came into existence millions of years before the lowest order of monkeys appeared on this planet, or that the system whereby the age of the earth's strata is estimated is and has been preposterously absurd. When Dr. Whitlock of the Department of Mineralogy, American Museum of Natural History, was shown the specimen, he said that in his opinion the yellow coloration, which so marvelously simulated the color of leather, was due to

the breaking down of iron pyrite crystals contained in the matrix of the fossil itself, and that the yellow color was therefore due to something similar to ferris oxide or iron rust. The sole of the shoe is so obviously "*the sole of a shoe*" with its bevelled welt and hand-stitched seams that no observer can doubt its origin or nature. It is the product of a human hand and was worn on a human foot!

Under a strong glass beautiful crystals of cinnabar, sulphide of mercury, are seen imposed upon the yellowish welt of the sole. Any decomposition of the iron pyrites would have been followed by similar breaking down of the cinnabar crystals. If oxidation had been proceeding when these cinnabar crystals were deposited they could not have been deposited for the reason, as advanced by Mr. Reid, that the formation of sulphides under such conditions would have been impossible.

SOME OF ITS FEATURES

One of the very remarkable features of the specimen is that the limestone itself contains no cinnabar crystals, indicating that the solution from which they crystallized upon the surface of the specimen conforms with what is found in all cinnabar deposits. Mr. Reid complicates matters all the more by pointing out that the line of least resistance for the flow of volatile or mineral-bearing solution is along the cleavage plains between succeeding layers of sedimentary deposits. This fact alone would prevent the cinnabar from reaching the interior of the rock, thus making it clear that the fossil was in place and buried beneath the surface when the quicksilver seams of the neighborhood were in the process of formation. Had this not been the case the silicon contained in the fossil could not have absorbed the mercurial deposit. Dr. Whitlock pronounced the specimen a very remarkable one, but because it upset all the scientific beliefs of the day, he was compelled to regard it as "an eccentric freak of nature." Dr. Matthews of the American Museum of Natural History pronounced the specimen to be a genuine fossil. He said he had never seen anything like it; that it certainly resembled the bottom of a shoe very, very much, and that if the facts of evolution could be disre-

garded so that we might not know, as we do know, that man could not have existed at that time, he would accept it as proof of his existence.

Professor Kemp of Columbia University was also obliged to regard the specimen as a marvelous freak of nature for the reason that he could not believe that man existed in the Triassic. Professor Boas of Columbia University pronounced it an extraordinary curiosity. Microphotographs taken at the Rockefeller Institute bring unmistakably the evidence of a very regular and very precise method of stitching. A striking feature of the fossil is that the right-hand side of the heel is slightly worn down, resembling what takes place in the wear of a modern shoe. Another striking feature is that the stitching is double and the welt extends all the way round the heel instead of stopping at the insole, as in the modern shoe. Moreover, there is a slight depression in the rock itself, showing that it was in the formative stage of pliability at the time the sole was impressed upon it. Had the rock not been soft at that time the accommodating impression could have been made only by the use of chisel and mallet.

IN PARADISE VALLEY

Will the geologists contend for millions of years, hundreds of thousands of years, or merely for a few years to account for the silicification of the sole of that Triassic shoe? In the graveyard at Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nevada, the body of a miner's wife was buried. The miner himself was working under the direction of Mr. Reid. His wife, on her deathbed, exacted from him the promise that as soon as he was able he would cause her remains to be removed to the east, where she was born. At the end of six years he undertook to discharge his promise. With great difficulty the body was exhumed, in a completely silicified condition. During the six years of its interment it had never been in the presence of any fluid solution of any kind. Nothing can explain the process of silicification, except the affinity of organic matter for silicon. The only solution of the mystery offered by science is that within the short period of six years the bombardment of silicon atoms passing through the walls of the

coffin was sufficiently intense to accomplish the extraordinary results reported here. Obviously the most astounding geological and physio-chemical phenomena can and do occur in short periods of time. G. F. Wright, the authority on glacial conditions, testifies to the unreliability of geological clocks as time-pieces. In the "Origin and Antiquity of Man" he advances proof to show that the portion of the glacial epoch during which man existed need not be more than 15,000 years in duration. The geologist, Prestwich, limits the entire glacial period in his "Story of the Earth and of Man" to but 25,000 years. Professor Penck calculated the time which has elapsed since North America rose out of the waters (since the glacial period) as not less than 5,500 and not more than 7,500 years. The calculations based on the deposits made by rivers are absolutely worthless for the reason that an avalanche, a flood, or other catastrophe could bring more matter into a flowing stream in one day than would otherwise be deposited in a hundred years.

EXTRAVAGANT CLAIMS OF GEOLOGISTS

Now the question is: Was man on the face of the earth with the trilobites, in the Triassic, millions of years ago, as indicated by the Reid fossil, or are the methods of the geologists in estimating the age of the world infinitely more extravagant than their own astounding contradictions have already indicated? Must we accept their own contradictions, discrepancies and paradoxes for no other reason than that they tell us that the Mosaic narrative of creation is unreliable?

Alas, for the reliability of *Pithecanthropus Erectus* and *Eoanthropus*. The Dawn-Man freak of Piltdown was "robbed of a muzzle that ill became him" when modern palaeontologists separated the chimpanzee mandible from the human skull-cap. The ape-man of Java never lived, yet these two extraordinary specimens, and the weird inference drawn from the celebrated Neanderthal remains, are all we have to prove the theory of man's descent from an ape. The thinker who accepts any theory of evolution, based upon the absurd assumptions of geology and palaeontology, in order to escape criticism to the effect that he possesses a medieval mind, merely ceases to think, and

substitutes for a rational conclusion such an act of faith in evolutionary dogma as he professes to despise when he beholds other men on their knees in prayer.

The Priest in Politics

*Lecture Delivered in Dublin by the Rev. Peter Finlay, S.J.,
at the National University*

(From the "Irish Catholic")

"The Priest in Politics," "the Church in Politics," are cries often raised by politicians whose views or measures are opposed by the clergy or condemned by the Church. The Church may not pronounce on any political question: the clergy should limit their activity to the Chapel and the Sacristy, and should be careful even there to speak only on spiritual matters. Now, the priest has just the same right to discuss politics, to put forward his view of them, and to make converts to that view, as any other member of the community. By becoming a priest he lost none of his civil rights. The Church, indeed, into whose service he entered, can make laws for him, which he is bound to obey. She can forbid him certain acts, a certain manner of life, otherwise freely open to him—such as marriage and the practice of civil law; and he is obliged in conscience to refrain from what she forbids. Should he refuse obedience, she may take cognizance of his act, and visit it with, at least, spiritual penalties. But with all this the State has no concern, nor any right of interference. It might as well intermeddle with the Church Commandment of Sunday Mass, or with the Church prohibition of flesh meats on Friday. As the legislation of the Church for her own children is a matter between her and them, with which outsiders have no call to meddle, so her legislation for the clergy, by which their right is abridged, affects only the clergy themselves. Even Catholics themselves have no claim either to object to the legislation or to enforce its observance.

CHURCH LEGISLATION

And the Church has legislated very definitely on the action of the clergy in politics. She has been ever mindful

of the example of her Founder; political feeling, we know, ran high in Palestine during Our Lord's public life; there is no trace of it in any of His words or acts. He refused to give even a verbal approval to the Nationalist movement against Rome. His Apostles followed the example of their Master; in the discourses of the Acts and in the Apostolic Letters we find no reference whatever to the politics of the day. St. Paul even warns Timothy: "No man being a soldier to God entangleth himself with secular business, that he may please Him to whom he hath engaged himself"; a warning, as is clear, which includes political entanglements. "Let clerics and monks not mix themselves up with worldly affairs" is a constantly recurring maxim of the Canon Law, and is the principle which underlies much of the legislation in Benedict XV's new code. The Church in Ireland, too, has adopted it in many of its local laws, in the statute of the last Synod of Maynooth, for instance, which confirms a decree of the Synod of 1882, and says: "All priests are forbidden to be present at any public meeting without the express consent of the parish priest in whose parish the meeting is held"; and curates are also forbidden to be present at such meetings in their own parish without the consent of the parish priest." When there is question of politics in Church, the prohibition is still more severe. "We strictly forbid," the Bishops say, "during the celebration of Mass—which would be clearly unbecoming—or at all in church, the treating of merely secular matters, such as political elections and the like, which might easily bring about misunderstanding between a pastor and his people, and cause grave social disorder. Therefore, if any priest should treat of political matters, or, in contempt of the command of the Synod of Thurles, should denounce anyone by name in church, let him be punished by suspension, or by some other penalty as the Ordinary may think fit." And, referring particularly to the election of Poor Law Guardians and of Members of Parliament, whose influence may affect the interests of the poor and the rights of the Church, the Fathers of the Synod bid priests to have at heart the election of upright men, not unfriendly to the Catholic religion; but add: "Out of church, however, without turbu-

lence, without breach of charity, with due submission to the Bishop, lest discussion should arise among the clergy, and with that moderation which is demanded by the priestly state, leaving to every one the liberty of judging for himself in doubtful matters." The late Pope, too, Benedict XV, first in an Encyclical letter to all the Bishops of the Church, and afterwards (Jan., 1917) in a Decree which he issued through the Consistorial Congregation insists that "the subject matter of sermons must be essentially sacred, and, if the preacher should wish to treat of other matters not strictly sacred, though befitting God's house, he must ask and obtain permission from the Ordinary of the place, who shall never grant it unless after mature consideration, and because of some evident necessity. But all preachers," the Decree continues, "are forbidden entirely and absolutely, to treat in Church of political matters."

CIVIL RIGHTS OF CLERGY

All this, however, is domestic legislation with which, as we have said, the Civil State and the lay world have no right to meddle. So far as they are concerned, the Catholic clergy have exactly the same civil rights as all other citizens. If the Church thinks fit to limit her clergy's right to be present at public meetings, if she lays down conditions for their taking part in political elections, if she forbids absolutely all reference to politics in Church, she only exercises an authority which her clergy have freely elected to obey. But if the clergy or members of the clergy should disregard the Church's laws, should appear on public platforms without a required permission, should take a prominent part in political propaganda, should even treat of politics in church and during church services, the State has no ground of complaint; nor has any section of the community, except Catholic worshipers, who may fairly claim that the clergy shall allow them peace in the practise of their religion, and shall not at Mass and other public exercises of devotion replace the Gospel of Christ by political declamations. Church authority may intervene, and compel obedience to Church laws; but no other authority can; no other is any more entitled to interfere with

the political utterances and action of the clergy, within or without their churches, than it is to interfere with an expression of political opinion by doctors or lawyers or any other class of the community.

No doubt the clergy themselves, in loyalty to the spirit of Church legislation and to the plain requirements of their calling, should be anxious to be "all things to all men that they may save all." They should be like St. Paul, "giving no offense to any man, that our ministry be not blamed," and saying with him: "If meat scandalize my brother, I will not eat meat forever, lest I should scandalize my brother." They will subordinate politics to the interests of souls; and will be silent, even out of church and in private intercourse, on political issues, if speech is likely to create dissension among Catholics, to estrange good men from the clergy and from the practice of religion, and so set obstacles in the way of men's salvation. Further, if circumstances allow them to exercise their rights as citizens, without contravening either the letter or the spirit of the Church's legislation, and if they decide on going down into the political arena, they are to act always, as the Synod of Maynooth warns them, in a manner befitting the clerical profession; and they are to remember that they carry with them no clerical authority. A man's political opinions, his political pronouncements, have no added value from the fact that he is a priest. It is otherwise, of course, as we shall see, when he has to advise on political issues which involve revealed religion or the moral law. But we speak of politics at present which are purely political; and in them it is plain that the views of the clergy are of no more importance than those of any other intelligent, educated gentlemen. In questions of agriculture, technical education, commerce, architecture, finance, and kindred subjects, others may be, often are, more competent judges, wiser counsellors; so, too, it may be in politics. In these, then, if they choose to take part in them, the clergy must be prepared for the same criticism, contradiction, opposition as others meet with; and, while they have no more claim to a hearing than any other politicians, they run risk of weakening their divinely-given authority as priests.

But politics are not always merely political; they involve at times the very gravest moral and religious issues. When they do, may the Church pass judgment on them? May she, should she ever, in such circumstances, point out the line of duty to her children, the conscientious obligation under which they lie? There are those who would rule out the question altogether, on the ground that politics need not, and ought not, take any account of religion or morality. Private life and public life are measured by wholly different standards. The former should conform to the law of God and the law of nature, and in the case of Catholics to the Church's law; the latter must have regard only to the welfare of the State. The former should be governed by conscience, applying to all individual acts the fixed rules of conduct, or right and wrong, which Christianity has accepted for the past nineteen centuries. The latter need look only to opportunism and expediency. What is of immediate benefit to the State or to a party in it is allowable, perhaps even obligatory, whatever commandment may be alleged against it. The will of the people is the supreme standard of public right, and when, in their majority, they approve of a political measure or course of action, it needs no other justification.

Hence, in political life, a man is not to be hampered by the religious and moral principles which are binding upon him as a private Christian. He may proclaim theories, he may promote legislation which he thinks likely to win popular applause, and to bring him and his friends an increase of influence and power; even though such theories and legislation run counter to God's law and the common teachings of religion. He may lie, he may perjure himself, if it serve his party or his country. He may defame opponents, forge evidence, injure property, steal, do bodily hurt, even murder, if he judge it necessary. In the process, he and others will palliate, if not justify the wrong-doing; and in the result, if it be successful, there will be many, if not to commend him, at least to hold him free from blame. "The end," political opportunists hold, "does really justify the means"—a doctrine which the Church can never allow.

There is not one moral or religious law for the individual

man and another for masses of men. When God gave the Commandments on Sinai, and when Our Lord sent His apostles to preach His Gospel, there was no reservation or exception in favor of political issues or of political parties. Politicians are as much bound to speak the truth and to refrain from slander as are barristers and doctors. They may no more organize robbery, do violence to property or person, foment civil discords, or bring about unjust wars, than may priests, or University professors, or banking and commercial companies. Their words and acts may be as grossly immoral as those of any other class or profession. And so, too, may be their collective action in legislation: a State law may be in plain violation of reason and justice. Such would be a law forbidding the sale or importation of wine even for Sacramental purposes; such would be any measure that interfered with a parent's right to educate his children; such, again, a law abolishing all private property. The Irish Penal Laws were almost all essentially immoral. So has been much modern anti-Catholic legislation in Italy, France, and Portugal. And Soviet legislation in Russia is at present largely a deliberate attack on the hitherto accepted principles of morality and religion.

Politics, therefore—the doctrines, aims, methods of politicians, and the laws which they make or administer, may have a moral and religious side; they may be profoundly immoral and irreligious. If they should be, has the Church a right to pronounce upon them? Has she the right, it may be even the duty, to warn the faithful against what is evil in them, to justify and counsel resistance to them? With politics, as mere politics, the Church, we have said, and the clergy as ministers of the Church, have no call or claim to interfere. But the Church is the divinely appointed teacher and guardian of the Christian religion—of Christian doctrines and of Christian morality. She has been commissioned to declare all revealed truths, as it concerns both belief and conduct, not to individuals only, but to groups of men and to whole peoples. And her teaching is not to be mere abstract theory: she is not only to define dogmas; she is to apply her definitions to opposing errors, and, when necessary, she must condemn those errors. She is not only to proclaim the moral law; she is

to apply it to concrete acts and courses of conduct and to instruct the faithful how far an act or course of conduct is according or contrary to that law. She is not only to tell them that God forbids unjust killing: when occasion arises, she is to tell them also that in a given set of circumstances the taking of human life is the unjust killing which God forbids. She may not always have sufficient evidence before her on which to base a judgment: as was the case, the late Pope stated, in the recent European war; or the interests of souls—her supreme care—may counsel reticence, if only for a time: but that she has authority to judge in the particular instance what is erroneous religious or moral doctrine, and what iniquitous and sinful conduct, no well-informed Catholic may doubt. And that authority, it is clear, the Pope possesses throughout the Universal Church; the Bishops—each in the diocese which God has given him to rule.

Nay, further, it is for the teaching Church, represented by Pope and Bishops, not only to pass judgment on political acts and measures which involve religious or moral issues; but it is her right also to determine authoritatively in what cases those issues are involved. Here, as in the exercise of all her teaching and ruling office, she claims, and must claim, not only to teach and rule within the limits of the jurisdiction which Christ appointed to her; she claims, and must claim, also to determine what the limits of her jurisdiction are. Pope and Bishops may, at times should, intervene publicly and authoritatively in politics, when these are intimately connected with the divine commission entrusted directly to them; and it is for Pope and Bishops, and for them only, to declare authoritatively when that connection exists. The inferior clergy take a part as clergy in politics according to the judgment, and under the direction, of Pope and Bishops.

I N a
Ar
with r
attitud
was p
who s
ently
false,
them.
46, 19
thousa
man, I
surpri
who r
brainle
and w
that t
evolut
the ea
face o
assert
proves
whats
scient
rankin
terrib
body
was fl
that t
mind
deman
fact?
if to
logic?